

October 1, 1965

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

24925

it all in unselfish service for the well-being of mankind—for opportunity and tranquillity, prosperity, and peace.

My own life has had the special privilege for more than 30 years to be close to his life in association, admiration and affection.

I feel I can speak for all America in our every good wish to him on his birthday—for the day reminds us not only of the birth but of the worth of Theodore Francis Green.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, will the Senator from Rhode Island yield?

Mr. PASTORE. I yield.

Mr. MANSFIELD. There is not much I can add to what the distinguished senior Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. PASTORE] has just said about our former colleague, the esteemed Senator Green. The only man on whom has been bestowed the title of Chairman Emeritus of the Committee on Foreign Relations is the distinguished former Senator from Rhode Island.

I join my colleagues in expressing best wishes to Senator Green. He may be away from us, but he is never far from our thoughts.

Mr. PASTORE. I thank the Senator. I know that Senator Green will be highly pleased by the warm words delivered here today by his esteemed friend and former colleague, the Senator from Montana, our majority leader, MIKE MANSFIELD.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, will the Senator from Rhode Island yield?

Mr. PASTORE. I yield to the Senator from Alabama.

Mr. HILL. I commend the distinguished Senator from Rhode Island for his beautiful and eloquent tribute to Senator Green. It has been gratifying to me to hear this richly deserved, this most beautiful tribute. Senator Green is certainly worthy of the noble heritage of Roger Williams.

I join the senior Senator from Rhode Island in paying tribute to Theodore Francis Green for his heroic life, his many accomplishments, and his magnificent services to our country and to humanity.

Mr. PASTORE. I thank the Senator.

Mrs. SMITH. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. PASTORE. I yield to the distinguished Senator from Maine.

Mrs. SMITH. Mr. President, I should like to thank the distinguished Senator from Rhode Island for his statement in tribute to former Senator Theodore Francis Green and to ask him to express my good wishes, when he expresses his own and those of other Members of the Senate. I shall never forget the kindness to me when, as chairman of the Inaugural Committee, he asked me to accompany him as "his lady" to the ceremonies and activities on Inaugural Day of the second term of President Eisenhower.

Mr. PASTORE. I thank the Senator.

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. PASTORE. I yield to the distinguished Senator from Washington.

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. President, I associate myself with the eloquent remarks of the able and distinguished Senator

from Rhode Island and other Senators in tribute to Theodore Francis Green.

During his long period of service before retirement from the Senate, Senator Green represented the best in public service as a statesman, a scholar, a philanthropist—yes, even into his late eighties, as an athlete. We who frequent a special committee room of the Senate, where we get a little extra exercise, were always inspired by the vigor of Senator Green's participation in the athletic facilities made available to us.

Senator Green in indeed unique in American history. We who were associated with him in the U.S. Senate are the richer and the better for that association.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. PASTORE. I yield to the distinguished Senator from Missouri.

Mr. SYMINGTON. I am glad to associate myself with those of my colleagues congratulating Senator Theodore Francis Green on his 98th birthday. For many years I had the privilege of serving with him in this body. He was as highly respected and as much beloved by Members of the Senate as anyone in my experience. He was always in good humor, always kind, understanding, and helpful in committees, especially to junior Members like myself.

I hope and believe we shall have the privilege of celebrating Senator Green's 100th birthday anniversary 2 years from now.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. PASTORE. I yield to the distinguished Senator from Ohio.

Mr. LAUSCHE. I am delighted to join other Senators in expressing felicitations to former Senator Green on the occasion of his 98th birthday anniversary. My association with him was always inspiring. He was a gentle character. He was never offensive or cutting in his remarks. He was always accommodating, trying to help those with whom he worked.

I just remarked to Senator PASTORE that several years ago Senator Green delivered a talk before a breakfast group meeting which met at the Capitol on Wednesday morning each week. The subject of his talk was "The Time Is Now." In his remarks, Senator Green elaborated upon the necessity of not allowing time to pass for the execution of a task. Time when unused and allowed to pass never returns.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the text of that speech be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the speech was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE TIME IS NOW

(Senator Green's remarks at breakfast group meeting, Wednesday, May 4, 1960, 8:30 a.m., Vandenberg Room, the Capitol, Washington, D.C.)

Shortly after I accepted the invitation to lead this congressional breakfast group, I received a brief note from our chairman, Senator JOHN STENNIS, which simply read: "I am sure you will have something interesting and worthwhile for us." In all the long years which the good Lord has seen fit to allow me, I do not recall a single chal-

lenge which made me feel more lonely or unworthy.

What wise message could I leave with you here this morning? What was there about my life that could set me apart from the rest of you—all schooled in the same Christian tradition? Then a hard but obvious fact disturbed my meditation. I have lived longer than any of you and much longer than most. However much I might wish it otherwise, I am what might be called—but I hope respectfully—"an old man." The whole concept of time engulfed my thoughts and I was reminded of the eloquent message from the Gospel by John: "Work while it is day, for the night cometh when no man can work."

There is a story told of three devils who met to formulate the strategy they might best employ to ensnare the souls of men. The first devil advanced a plan that they roam throughout the world and proclaim that there is no God. The other devils discouraged him saying that men were too intelligent and the wonders of creation too convincing for men to accept that hypothesis. Then the second devil said: "I have the answer. We will go forth to all mankind and teach that the Bible is false; that it is nothing but a fraud." The other devils reproached him saying that man would never submit to that tactic because for centuries men had believed and loved and lived in testimony of the truth of Holy Writ. Then the shrewdest of all the devils offered the winning solution: "There is one sure way to capture the souls of men. We will simply tell all the inhabitants of the earth that 'there is plenty of time.'"

If I have learned one thing well in my long years, it is that there is never plenty of time. As the Good Book tells us, we know not the day nor the hour of our calling. The time for the lay apostolate is now.

It is more than coincidence that I, a Rhode Islander, should be asked to speak to you on this day, the 4th of May. On this date, in 1776, the Colony of Rhode Island and Providence Plantations, by action of its General Assembly and on the motion of my great grandfather, declared her independence from Great Britain, 2 months ahead of all the other American colonies, thus making her the oldest sovereign State in the whole Western Hemisphere. In her love for freedom, she threw off the shackles of an unwise parent who had forgotten that there were some things in life more precious than life itself. Those proud forebears of mine had the fortitude generated by faith in Almighty God, faith in each other and faith in the worth of their cause. They were true to the heritage of Roger Williams, the young refugee clergyman, who, 140 years earlier, founded our State and dedicated it to the principles of religious liberty and civil freedom in the face of overwhelming odds. The world stood aghast at this gallant little band of patriots from the smallest colony of all.

The great archeologist, James Breasted, reminds us that man became the first implement-making creature not later than the beginning of the ice age, probably a million years ago. At the same time he became the first weapon-making creature. Yet it is perhaps less than 5,000 years ago that man's conscience began to become a potent social force.

Today we are met at a fork in the highway of history. We who claim to be Christians and especially those of us privileged to serve as elected representatives of the people have a solemn duty. In our own country, we must covet no privilege for ourselves which we are not willing to share with every other citizen. In the worldwide clash with totalitarianism, at the very time when the sophisticated systems of modern warfare contain the capacity for mutual annihilation, we must pray for guidance. We must exert every positive peaceful influence within the scope of our

conscience and capabilities to save the world from those who would ruin it by their inhumanity, their injustice, and their immorality. Unless each of us conscientiously meets the political realities of the present, it may be later than we think for all of us.

As we ponder the restlessness about us today and search, each in his own heart, for his moment of destiny, let us recall some of the beautiful words from the first few verses of chapter III of Ecclesiastes:

"To all a season, and a time to every inclination under the heavens:

"A time to be born, and a time to die; a time to plant, and a time to pluck up the planting:

"A time to kill, and a time to heal; a time to break down, and a time to build:

"A time to weep, and a time to laugh; a time to mourn, and a time to dance:

"A time to rend, and a time to sew; a time to be silent, and a time to speak:

"A time to love, and a time to hate; a time of war, and a time of peace."

A few minutes ago, I introduced myself as one of the older generation. I make no claim, however, to the wisdom which is sometimes associated with age. Yet there lived many years ago an old man who was very wise and blessed. I refer to the Apostle Paul, who, as a prisoner awaiting execution in Nero's Rome, wrote a letter to some friends in the little church at Philippi, in Greece. In his letter, Paul wrote: "And this I pray, that your love may abound yet more and more in knowledge and all intelligence."

It is my hope that in the years remaining to us here, united in this Christian fellowship, the love of God will help us know our problems, give us the intelligence to perceive what should be done about them, and the courage to act accordingly, all in good time.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, I am delighted also to recall the great vigor exhibited by Senator Green while he was chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations in attending many engagements in foreign embassies that were incident to his work.

He was in the nineties, but he moved about with great ease. He attended all meetings to which he was invited. I believe that, up until the very day of his retirement, he followed his unbroken habit of responding to the call of his duties.

I wish him good health, a contented and continued life.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from Ohio.

I yield now to the distinguished Senator from Georgia.

Mr. TALMADGE. Mr. President, I desire to associate myself with my colleagues who have congratulated former Senator Green on his 98th birthday.

I came to the Senate in 1957. I was assigned to the Rules and Administration Committee, on which Senator Green was then the ranking Democrat. I had the privilege of knowing him well. I admired him greatly. He was not only a man of remarkable physical condition, but also his mind was sharp, bright, and alert.

He was one of the most charming men I have ever known. Several years ago when Senator Green was a Member of the Senate and about 93 or 94 years of age, Mrs. Talmadge and I were driving to a social function in Washington. She looked out the window and said, "There goes Senator Green walking down the street. Let us stop and ask if we can take him where he is going." We stopped and I asked Senator Green if he cared to ride with us. He thanked us very

courteously, but told us that he preferred to walk.

I doubt if there has ever been a man in the history of the United States who, at the approximate age of 95 years, preferred walking around the streets of Washington to riding.

I shall always cherish his memory. He has been one of the most remarkable men in the history of our country.

He was an able and courageous Governor of Rhode Island. He had a distinguished career as a Senator of the United States. I wish him long and continued good health. Like my colleagues, I am looking forward to helping him celebrate his 100th birthday.

I thank the Senator from Rhode Island.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, I yield to my distinguished colleague from Rhode Island.

Mr. PELL. Mr. President, it is with warm and heartfelt admiration that I join my colleagues in paying tribute to my venerable and distinguished predecessor, Theodore Francis Green, on the occasion of his 98th birthday. I rejoice that he is enjoying in his sprightly way, the many laurels which the years have conferred so generously upon him. Governor of our State during a period of change and revision, distinguished U.S. Senator for nearly a quarter of a century, chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee, scholar, athlete, lawyer, businessman and political extraordinary—he is a living tribute to the genius and durability of the New England character. His record is a challenge to us all, particularly to the junior Senator from Rhode Island who succeeded to his seat in 1960.

I am proud of the fact that in a modest way I have been able to follow a few of Senator Green's footsteps, as a member of the Foreign Relations Committee and now, this month, as a chairman of the U.S. delegation to the NATO parliamentarians' conference. If in the years ahead I can succeed in doing half as much as Senator Green did, I shall be happy indeed.

I join my colleagues in wishing Senator Green continued good health in the years ahead, knowing that he fully intends to fill his role as the oldest man to serve in the U.S. Senate by "serving" as a member emeritus well into his second century. And finally, I would point out that the Senate has given him a most appropriate birthday present by passing again a bill which it approved in earlier form in 1960 as his last legislative act. I refer to S. 1855, my bill to establish a Roger Williams National Memorial which was approved on September 23 and which is now pending on the House Calendar. Its final enactment will be a fitting way to open Theodore Francis Green's 99th year.

Mr. PASTORE. I thank my colleague. With the expression of those fine sentiments, I think we can conclude by saying to Theodore Francis Green, "ad multos annos."

NUCLEAR TEST BAN SAFEGUARDS

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Mr. Jack Rosen of the staff of the Joint Committee on

Atomic Energy be permitted the privilege of the floor during the discussion of my remarks in connection with nuclear test ban safeguards.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. President, 2 years have passed since the debate in this Chamber on the limited nuclear test ban treaty. That treaty received the overwhelming consent of this body. In considering the treaty, three committees met in combined session for many days of hearings. Those committees were the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, Senate Armed Services Committee, and the Senate membership of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy. In addition, the Preparedness Investigating Subcommittee of the Armed Services Committee held special hearings.

During the course of those lengthy hearings, the Chairman and all the members of the Joint Chiefs of Staff testified. These five eminent military leaders of our armed services supported the limited test ban treaty, but in doing so they set forth to the Senate the need for establishing safeguards for our security which would make possible our consent to this treaty.

Those four safeguards which the Joint Chiefs of Staff recommended and which President Kennedy endorsed in a letter to the majority and minority leaders of this body during the floor debate on the test ban treaty read as follows:

1. The conduct of comprehensive, aggressive, and continuing underground nuclear test programs designed to add to our knowledge and improve our weapons in all areas of significance to our military posture for the future.

2. The maintenance of modern nuclear laboratory facilities and programs in theoretical and exploratory nuclear technology which will attract, retain, and insure the continued application of our human scientific resources to these programs on which continued progress in nuclear technology depends.

3. The maintenance of the facilities and resources necessary to institute promptly nuclear tests in the atmosphere should they be deemed essential to our national security or should the treaty or any of its terms be abrogated by the Soviet Union.

4. The improvement of our capability, within feasible and practical limits, to monitor the terms of the treaty, to detect violations, and to maintain our knowledge of Sino-Soviet nuclear activity, capabilities, and achievements.

The Senate Preparedness Subcommittee of the Senate Armed Services Committee and the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy have followed the implementation of those safeguards very closely during the past 2 years. Each of these Committees has followed the safeguards in hearings on authorizing legislation and in special hearings. Recently, in 3 days of hearings, I chaired combined meetings of the Senate Special Subcommittee on Nuclear Safeguards and the Military Applications Subcommittee of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy looking into the current status of the four safeguards.

Mr. President, I mention that the members of the Nuclear Safeguards Subcommittee, comprised of myself as chairman, the distinguished senior Senator

October 1, 1965

24927

from Missouri [Mr. SYMINGTON], the distinguished senior Senator from Maine [Mrs. SMITH], and the distinguished chairman of the Preparedness Subcommittee of the Committee on Armed Services, the distinguished junior Senator from Mississippi [Mr. STENNIS]. From the Military Applications Subcommittee of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, we were fortunate to have the chairman of the Joint Committee of Atomic Energy, Representative HOLIFIELD, and Representative HOSMER, Representative BATES, the senior Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON], the senior Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. PASTORE], past chairman and current vice chairman of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, and the junior Senator from Nebraska [Mr. CURTIS].

In addition, we were ably assisted by the presence of Col. Glenn Smith, retired, from the staff of the Preparedness Subcommittee, and Jack Rosen from the staff of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, as well as the executive director of the staff of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, Mr. John Conway.

We are all aware that in the Senate, without the able assistance of professional staff people, we could not do our committee or Senate work properly.

We were fortunate in having such a high degree of professionalism in the presence of the gentleman to whom I have just referred.

Mr. President, I especially compliment and express my deep appreciation to the distinguished senior Senator from Missouri [Mr. SYMINGTON], who spent a good deal of time in the preparation for the hearings and in connection with the hearings as well.

The same is true of the distinguished senior Senator from Maine [Mrs. SMITH], who attended all our sessions and was most diligent and provocative in her interrogation, and who followed all the proceedings very closely.

Likewise the junior Senator from Mississippi [Mr. STENNIS], who served as an ex-officio member, was of great assistance in connection with the well-detailed hearings that we held.

I also express my appreciation to the other members of the Preparedness Subcommittee who were able to attend and participate in the hearings, as well as the other members of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy.

Mr. President, we heard testimony from the directors of our nuclear weapons laboratories, from one of the Atomic Energy Commissioners, from representatives of the Department of Defense, and from the Director of the Central Intelligence Agency. Much of what we heard was sensitive information relating vitally to our national security which cannot be disclosed in an unclassified manner, but I do believe that I can report to the Senate in an unclassified way a summary sketch of the conclusions that I drew from sitting through those hearings, conclusions which I believe are shared by my colleagues from both committees who participated in these meetings.

First, I can report to the Senate that the Atomic Energy Commission, ably assisted by the Department of Defense, has

indeed been carrying out during these past 2 years a comprehensive, aggressive, and continuing underground nuclear test program. The AEC has announced the conduct of 62 underground tests since the test ban treaty was signed. Most of these have been weapons research or development tests, some have been Department of Defense weapons effects tests, others have been tests for Plowshare—a program to develop nuclear explosives for peaceful purposes. Two tests have been carried out in this period for the purpose of research on seismic detection of underground nuclear explosions.

Significant information has been developed from these underground nuclear explosions. Information of great importance to our national security and to the development of peaceful nuclear explosive technology has been acquired.

The second safeguard concerns the maintenance of modern laboratory facilities and programs in nuclear technology. From the testimony received by the two committees on August 16 and 17 of this year, I can report to you that our weapons laboratories have been adequately supported in these past 2 years by both the Congress and the executive branch. It was also made clear to us, however, by our weapons laboratory directors that the viability and vigor of our nuclear weapons laboratories depends upon the underground test programs. Without the opportunity to carry out the necessary experiments, the weapons development program would soon stagnate and our scientists would look elsewhere for challenges to their intellects. Speculation and even careful theoretical studies must be subject to experimental verification if the results are to be meaningful and productive. Our laboratories are carrying out fruitful and meaningful programs involving experiments with sophisticated research instruments and, as necessary, with nuclear explosives within the terms of the limited test ban treaty.

Safeguard No. 3 relates to the maintenance of facilities and resources necessary to institute promptly nuclear tests in the atmosphere, should the treaty be abrogated or should the supreme interests of our country require this. Possible example: Extraordinary developments by the Chinese Communists. The AEC and Department of Defense witnesses who appeared before us testified that the readiness achieved and being maintained is adequate to our needs. Some of our members have a concern, however, that a time of abrogation of the treaty will be a critical time and therefore our readiness to carry out significant weapons tests of great import should be an almost instant readiness. While we are much better prepared today than we were in 1961 when the Soviets resumed atmospheric testing and while instant readiness is impossible, we are not in my opinion as ready as we should be for the circumstance of an abrogation of the treaty by the Soviet Union. Here again I would like to point up the close relationship between our readiness to resume significant atmospheric tests and the continuance of an aggressive, comprehensive underground test program. Without continued

underground tests our readiness program would be essentially a sterile program.

The fourth safeguard is the safeguard of monitoring the terms of the limited test ban treaty and maintaining our knowledge of Sino-Soviet nuclear activity. From the evidence available to our committees I feel that the limited test ban treaty is being monitored well. We have, as you know, had satellites instrumented for the detection of high altitude events, and instruments for the detection of atmospheric events are emplaced around the world. Members of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy soon after the signing of the test ban treaty traveled around the world to inspect our detection capabilities and to determine at first hand what improvements were needed. In the past 2 years improvements have been made in our capability to monitor the limited test ban treaty.

Research has also been going on with regard to detecting and identifying underground nuclear explosions which are now legal under the test ban treaty but would be illegal under a comprehensive or a total test ban treaty. Progress is being made through the construction of large seismic arrays and the use of computers to improve our capability of detecting seismic shocks and of identifying natural earthquakes. However, as we lower the seismic detection threshold we detect many more seismic events. In fact, one school of thought is concerned that as we lower the detection threshold we might complicate the task of identifying the cause of the seismic event. Construction and emplacement of these improved detection equipments is underway, and it is much too early to make a reliable judgment on the successes of these techniques. If we can increase the percentage of identification of natural earthquakes, this will reduce the number of events that are in the uncertain category—that is, events that are uncertain as to whether they are natural earthquakes or produced by underground explosions. If they are suspected as underground explosions we must have some means of determining if they were from a conventional, that is high explosive, source or from a nuclear explosion. No method has been suggested to us for identifying underground nuclear explosions by their seismic signals. Positive identification of underground nuclear explosions depends upon the collecting of some kind of radioactive debris either because the test has vented to the atmosphere or we have dug down at the site of the test and discovered such debris. Now there may be several reasons for being suspicious that a given seismic signal is manmade and not natural, but being suspicious is not synonymous with the verification of that suspicion.

I might add at this point, while all the members of the two committees attending the hearings were quite impressed with the research going forward in the seismic detection field, several members were concerned that a similar active and priority research program is not moving nearly so fast in studying the art of decoupling, muffling, or concealing underground nuclear tests. Some work has been done along this line but

the effort has been very limited and several members expressed their concern that we are undertaking negotiations which could lead to a comprehensive test ban without being sufficiently informed about the techniques that could be employed to circumvent the terms of such a treaty. In this connection it is worth emphasizing that the art of concealment of nuclear tests, when it is pursued, goes forward, in my opinion, faster than the art of detection.

This point I wish to emphasize, because it was confirmed by the distinguished scientists who were present at our hearings.

I should also point out that, if an underground nuclear explosion is small enough, it will escape detection, even by the improved detection system. Methods of making relatively large underground nuclear explosions look seismically like small explosions are also possible. I for one do not believe that "what we do not know cannot hurt us." In fact, the opposite is true. Knowledge gained from even small underground nuclear explosions is important and we can never say that such knowledge may not be crucial.

Remember that we do not know how to identify underground nuclear explosions from a distance and, if they are small or decoupled, we do not even detect them. For a long time the Soviets were claiming all underground nuclear explosions are detectable and on-site inspections are unnecessary. Similar to the Nazi propaganda policy before World War II they apparently believe if you tell a lie enough times people will eventually believe it. Unfortunately, such statements have been repeated often enough and apparently convinced some of our allies and many of the so-called neutral nations that this is so. It is interesting, therefore, to note that according to the London Economist issue of August 21-27, this year, the Soviet Ambassador to the Geneva Disarmament Conference, Semyon Tsarapkin, admitted on August 11, that Russia's seismologists cannot tell whether all subterranean events are nuclear explosions or not. Tsarapkin did not go on to admit or talk about the necessity of on-site inspections to monitor a comprehensive test ban treaty.

Recently at the Geneva Disarmament Conference a comprehensive test ban treaty was discussed. I can tell you now, without fear of contradiction, that we do not know how to monitor a comprehensive test ban treaty so that we will be able to adequately verify the terms of such a treaty without on-site inspections.

With respect to the limited test ban treaty, I feel that that treaty has worked to our benefit and the free world's benefit due in a major way to the proposal of the Joint Chiefs of Staff for the four safeguards, and because those four safeguards are being implemented. I might mention, Mr. President, that the Joint Chiefs of Staff consider that the progress which has been made is satisfactory in meeting the requirements of the four safeguards to which I have referred in my remarks. A comprehensive test ban would destroy three of those safeguards and without adequate means of verification, including on-site inspections, would

make a mockery of the fourth safeguard.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, will the Senator define the term "comprehensive"?

Mr. JACKSON. If the Senator will defer for a moment, I shall be through with my prepared remarks.

Mr. President, the Congress cannot rest on what it has done. Programs must be implemented by the administration, and the Congress must from time to time check into that implementation. Our combined committees of the Senate Armed Services Committee and the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy expect the staffs of the committees to keep in constant touch with the implementation of the safeguards and the committee chairmen and the members intend to hold review hearings on these safeguards at least once each year.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Washington yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MONROYA in the chair). Does the Senator from Washington yield to the Senator from Ohio?

Mr. JACKSON. I am happy to yield to the Senator from Ohio.

Mr. LAUSCHE. My recollection is that when the limited test ban treaty was adopted, the ban was imposed upon tests except those committed underground and provided that when committed underground they did not diffuse radioactive debris upon the lands of adjoining nations and in the air. Having in mind the limited test ban treaty, what other inclusions would there be in banning tests in the comprehensive ban?

Mr. JACKSON. Let me amplify for a moment on what is prohibited. Under the test ban treaty, atmospheric testing is prohibited; outer space testing is prohibited; and underwater testing is also prohibited. This leaves only testing underground. Therefore, a comprehensive test ban would cover the last area, which is underground testing, so as to prohibit all nuclear weapons testing.

Mr. LAUSCHE. The Senator stated that if a comprehensive test ban was agreed upon, three of the safeguards which he identified would be eliminated. Would the Senator elaborate on that item?

Mr. JACKSON. The first safeguard which would be eliminated would be the ability to conduct underground tests and second our ability to maintain adequate, modern, and effective laboratories. I do not believe there is any question that if scientists are not given the opportunity to test, the weapons laboratories will go down to zero. The whole basis of science involves experimentation and, therefore, we would be cutting off our ability to move forward, and to maintain our security through scientific achievement. In recent times, our security has been based primarily upon the ability to marshal the resources of science and technology and to use those resources in order to advance the security of our Nation and other free nations. If we had a comprehensive test ban I am sure that the ability to maintain a modern nuclear capability and to maintain adequate personnel in our laboratories would come to an end.

As I said before, it would eliminate our ability to carry out a vigorous underground testing program. At the present time I can report to the Senate that we are actually doing much better underground in our testing than we had anticipated.

We are making good progress in maintaining a modern, up-to-date nuclear arsenal. With the denial of testing we would lose that opportunity, and lastly, we would not be able to do the job of monitoring effectively a test ban which is comprehensive if it did not provide for adequate on-site inspections.

We simply cannot, with the scientific information available to us, undertake a comprehensive test ban treaty which would ban underground testing without on-site inspection.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Will the Senator elaborate upon his statement—

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, will the Senator from Washington yield?

Mr. JACKSON. I also, of course, should mention that our ability to maintain a state of readiness to test in the atmosphere would be lost, because in time the laboratories would disintegrate and we would not have the capability, in the event of a surprise move—such as occurred in 1961 by the Soviets—to resume testing.

Mr. LAUSCHE. The Senator made the statement that experience has demonstrated that the claims made by Soviet Russia that scientific instruments were available which would record with clarity and certainty whether a seismic tremor was produced by natural causes or by an atomic explosion has been demonstrated to be unsound and untrue.

Mr. JACKSON. The Soviet statement is false. While we can detect seismic disturbances—

Mr. LAUSCHE. Yes.

Mr. JACKSON. We cannot identify them as underground nuclear tests short of on-site inspections.

Mrs. SMITH. Mr. President, will the Senator from Washington yield?

Mr. JACKSON. I am happy to yield to the distinguished lady from Maine, who has worked so helpfully and so ably in connection with the hearings.

Mrs. SMITH. Mr. President, I wish to commend the Junior Senator from Washington for the excellent leadership that he has given as chairman of our watchdog group on the test ban safeguards. I share the concern that he has expressed for the need to do more with respect to certain safeguards. I share his views with respect to the grave dangers of a comprehensive test ban treaty at this time unless there are ironclad on-site inspection safeguards established. Apparently Russia will not agree to on-site inspection.

Since the ratification of the test ban treaty, there has been the very grave development of Red China joining the nuclear power club with her nuclear capability having been indicated in the nuclear explosions that she has achieved. Inasmuch as Red China is not a party to the nuclear test ban treaty, she is not restrained with respect to making open air nuclear tests as are the parties to the treaty. It is further clear that Red

October 1, 1965

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

24929

China would not only refuse on-site inspection as has Russia but that Red China will continue to be a growing threat in the development of nuclear power without the restraint of a test ban treaty.

Under present conditions, the only question is one of time as to when Red China attains a degree of nuclear capability as to threaten the security of the United States, which Red China has vowed to destroy. Thus, time is working against the best interests of the United States and our country must be prepared to resume testing as soon as possible in the event of abrogation of the test ban treaty by Russia or any of the other parties to the treaty.

While progress has been made on this safeguard, I agree with the able junior Senator from Washington that we need to do more and in a real sense of urgency.

Mr. President, in closing, I wish to thank my distinguished colleague for his generous remarks with respect to me personally. It has been a privilege to serve with him as chairman.

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. President, I deeply appreciate the thoughtful remarks of the Senator from Maine. She has taken a keen interest throughout the hearings, and prior to the hearings, in this important problem of nuclear test ban safeguards.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, will the Senator from Washington yield?

Mr. JACKSON. I am happy to yield to the Senator from Mississippi.

Mr. STENNIS. I thank the Senator from Washington for yielding to me.

Mr. President, I wish especially to highly commend the membership of this subcommittee of our Preparedness Subcommittee for the very fine and outstanding work which they have done this year in a highly important but very difficult field; namely, an overlook of the four safeguards that were definitely adopted by the Preparedness Subcommittee during the hearings in 1963 on the nuclear test ban treaty. The Senator from Washington was the author of that resolution providing for those safeguards. This subcommittee of our Preparedness Subcommittee is charged with the responsibility of making a continuing surveillance over this safeguard program.

This is a highly technical field. It is a very difficult field. But the Senator from Washington is unusually well qualified in this field and has done an excellent job. The work of this subcommittee is of unquestioned value to the entire Nation.

I had the privilege of asking these three Members, the Senator from Washington [Mr. JACKSON], the Senator from Maine [Mrs. SMITH], and the Senator from Missouri [Mr. SYMINGTON], to serve on that subcommittee and later appointing them. They have done an unusual piece of high quality work. They have been diligent and conscientious, and have made a report of value and significance, of value to every department of the Government, particularly in the field of the military, in the field of the Department of State, in the field of the Atomic Energy Commission, and others.

I take great pride in their achievement and the report they have filed, and

wish personally to thank them. I am sure I speak for the other Members of the Senate and for the people of the Nation. I look forward to their further activities in this highly important field. We can all rest assured that the legislative department, the Congress is well represented in this field of legislative overlook and that the work is in competent and dedicated hands.

Mr. JACKSON. I know I speak for the members of our special subcommittee in expressing to the chairman of the subcommittee, the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. STENNIS], our appreciation for the support he has given us. The fact that the staff was able to provide its best professional talents is in no small measure responsible for whatever work we were able to do. We are deeply indebted to the chairman of the subcommittee, Mr. STENNIS.

Mrs. SMITH. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me at that point?

Mr. JACKSON. I yield to the Senator from Maine.

Mrs. SMITH. I would like to join with the distinguished Senator from Washington, chairman of our special subcommittee, in expressing appreciation and thanks to the very able chairman of the Subcommittee on Preparedness, Mr. STENNIS. It has been a very great privilege to serve under the leadership such as the Senator from Mississippi has given us. I want to personally express my thanks to him. I also want to pay my respects to the senior Senator from Missouri for his outstanding work as a member of the watchdog committee on the test ban safeguards. He has made a great contribution to his country in these endeavors.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. JACKSON. I am glad to yield now to the distinguished Senator from Missouri, who spent much time in preparation for the hearings, and who made valuable contributions to this work.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, I would associate myself with the remarks of the distinguished chairman of the Military Preparedness Subcommittee, Mr. STENNIS, and the distinguished Senator from Maine [Mrs. SMITH], about the outstanding work the Senator from Washington [Mr. JACKSON] has done with respect to this matter.

It could well be—and I believe it probably is—the most important subject the free world has to face today.

As a result of the work of the Special Subcommittee on Nuclear Safeguards, with the able Senator from Mississippi [Mr. STENNIS] and the able Senator from Maine [Mrs. SMITH], we now have a factual statement about this problem which may be somewhat overdue, because so many people who talk on the subject do not go into the details as has the distinguished Senator from Washington and his committee in this investigation.

As the Senate remembers, the Preparedness Subcommittee did not approve the test ban treaty. However, the distinguished Senator from Washington [Mr. JACKSON] and I voted for it and at that time discussed it at great length.

What particularly appeals to me about this statement is that, first, he does not express complete satisfaction with respect to the maintenance of facilities and resources which are vital; and, secondly, he points out in clear fashion the dangers of any comprehensive treaty without adequate on-site inspection.

I am glad the Senator is supported in that position by the distinguished Senator from Maine, who has also worked hard to obtain the facts in this field.

I was one of the Senators appointed to go to Geneva to observe but because of the sharpness of the denial of any interest in the proposed treaty on the part of the Soviet delegate, Mr. Tsarapkin, the meeting recessed.

I again congratulate the Senator from Washington for this report. It is a major contribution to the future security of the United States.

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. President, I would like to conclude by saying that it is the intention of the Special Subcommittee on Nuclear Safeguards and the Military Applications Subcommittee of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy to submit a classified report to the executive department going into greater detail and giving classified information which we could not do in this discussion on the floor. I give assurance that we shall do everything we can, in a non-partisan way, to fulfill a commitment—it was a covenant—between the Senate and the executive branch on the four safeguards mentioned. If we maintain those four safeguards conscientiously and with great diligence, I have no doubt about our ability to maintain our own defense posture and to deter thermonuclear war.

BREAKFAST GROUP REMARKS OF SENATOR FANNIN

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, on Wednesday morning of this week our esteemed friend, Senator PAUL J. FANNIN, of Arizona, made some remarks to a breakfast group meeting of Senators here in the Capitol. He summed up in a few minutes much of the wisdom of the ages as well as some of his own wisdom. He also gave clear and necessary guidelines of conduct for our future if we successfully maintain self-government and individual freedom. I consider the Senator's remarks highly valuable, constructive, and timely as did all who heard him.

I commend Senator FANNIN, and also commend the reading of this wonderful address to each Member of the Senate and the House and to citizens throughout the Nation. In order that it may have wide publication, I ask unanimous consent that his remarks be included in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

REMARKS BY SENATOR PAUL J. FANNIN, SENATE BREAKFAST GROUP, SEPTEMBER 29, 1965

More than 50 years ago, a famous British jurist, Lord Moulton, made some observations on law and manners which I submit are still valid and worthy of our serious consideration today. In his article he out-

lined what he called the three great domains of human action. First was the domain of positive law which prescribes our actions and which must be obeyed.

At the opposite end of the scale he put the domain of free choice, which includes all those acts we claim a right to perform in complete freedom. But in between these two domains, he said there is another large and important area ruled neither by positive law nor absolute freedom.

He called this vital middle ground the domain of the unenforceable. How large this area is depends upon the extent to which a nation trusts its citizens and the way they behave in response to that trust. Lord Moulton concluded that in the final analysis—and at this point I quote him exactly: "The true measure of a nation's greatness is the extent to which the individuals composing the Nation can be trusted to obey self-imposed law."

If we apply Lord Moulton's standard of greatness to the United States of America today, how do we measure up? This is a sobering question for which there is no easy answer. But it is a question all Americans should be asking themselves today.

At this moment in history, I am concerned that our country is not measuring up to greatness in all of the ways that it can and should. The annual FBI reports have been indicating an alarming increase in crime for a long time. But it has taken a savage explosion of mob violence in Los Angeles to shock us into recognizing that crime has become the number one domestic issue confronting our Nation. Since the riots I'm sure all of us have formed some personal opinions on the subject. The public dialog of condemnation and explanation continues—and this is as it should be in a free society.

Seldom in our history has a thorough, searching national discussion been more in order. In one of our own recent meetings—incidentally I count these meetings among the most rewarding associations of my brief Senate experience—we enjoyed a fine talk on some aspects of this problem by Senator Wallace Bennett.

More recently in a talk on the floor, our colleague, Senator ROBERT BYRD, of West Virginia, put the Los Angeles riot in proper perspective as another horrible example of the overall weakening state of law and order in the land.

We can no longer afford to ignore the unmistakable evidence that a moral cancer is spreading in our society. Including the recent additions of mass murder and destruction, our crime rate now represents a serious threat to the basic codes of human behavior which most Americans have long taken for granted. Because we have been entrusted with public responsibility at a high level, it is especially incumbent upon us to defend these codes and reinforce them by all possible means.

A vital first step in preparing this defense is suggested by a phrase in the constitution of my State of Arizona which I want to share with you. Section 1 of article 2 reads as follows:

"A frequent recurrence to fundamental principles is essential to the security of individual rights and the perpetuity of free government."

In another troubled age, 600 years before Christ, we were admonished in much the same language by the prophet Jeremiah when he said: "Stand ye in the old ways, and see, and ask for the old paths, where is the good way, and walk therein."

Surely no further warnings should be needed to convince us that we have strayed from the proven good way of the past, and that we have been neglecting our fundamental principles. All of us know that among these fundamental principles is personal responsibility for one's own conduct and actions. Behind this principle is the combined

weight and experience of our Judeo-Christian heritage.

Like our fathers and grandfathers before us, we have been taught a morality which places a distinct obligation upon each individual in our society. We have built our society on the firm belief that the Creator endowed each of us with certain inalienable rights. And because of our belief in the worth and dignity of the individual, we have constructed a framework of constitutional law to protect and enforce the rights of each citizen.

Implicit in both our spiritual and governmental life has always been the concept of responsibility accompanying privilege. For every right there is a corresponding duty.

Referring to Lord Moulton's categories of human action, our Founding Fathers deliberately expanded the realm of free choice beyond anything ever attempted before.

In all of their recorded statements or published writings, so far as I can determine, there is nothing to indicate they ever gave any credence to the idea that civil responsibility was a collective matter. To them it was highly personal and individual—and they had supreme confidence in the ability of a free republic, conceived in liberty and dedicated to human welfare, to grow and prosper under this concept. In short, they were convinced that it is the individual who makes society, and not society the individual.

Contrast that with the modern doctrine expressed by sociologists and, unfortunately, even some public officials, that society is somehow responsible for the criminal acts of a few individuals. For example, how often have you heard well-meaning people say that "society is really to blame for juvenile delinquency"?

Or consider the rash of statements in the wake of the terrible riots in Los Angeles. From spokesmen prominent in Government, religion, and the civil rights movement we heard incredible assertions that all of us must share some of the guilt of those who killed, burned, and looted.

This absurd notion should have no place in American thought. The fact that it has been accepted by so many otherwise intelligent people is a graphic illustration of how far we have deviated from our original principles.

Those who assembled at Philadelphia to write the Constitution would have rejected this kind of thinking. They believed—as we still do—that man does have the inherent capacity to govern himself, if he is encouraged and trained to do so.

Thus our Constitution and laws impose the minimum possible amount of restraint upon the individual in the exercise of his freedom.

Again in Lord Moulton's terms, our system places a tremendous degree of trust in the individual citizen to obey self-imposed law. And by that standard of measurement, we did indeed achieve greatness as a Nation. At the same time, however, the founders of our Republic knew very well that unrestricted democracy would degenerate into anarchy, just as unbridled license will destroy the individual. James Madison and Alexander Hamilton, two of the authentic geniuses of the Convention, argued this point with eloquence and determination. It was Hamilton who declared, and I quote:

"Give all power to the many, and they will oppress the few. Give all power to the few, they will oppress the many. Both, therefore, ought to have the power that each may defend itself against the other. . . . We are forming a republican government. Real liberty is never found in despotism or the extremes of democracy. If we incline too much to democracy, we shall soon shoot into monarchy."

The inspired result was a system of government which defined and guaranteed indi-

vidual rights but also demanded of each citizen that he respect the rights of others. This duty of the individual citizen, under our system of constitutional government, is in perfect harmony with the spiritual commands of the Christian faith, because it is derived directly from them.

When we say that every American should respect the rights of others, whether it be their person or property, isn't this just another practical way of following the Golden Rule of Christ? We were told by Christ that all laws rested upon two fundamental commandments; namely, that we should love the Lord above all things and that we should also love our neighbors as ourselves.

From the fine presentation by Senator JENNINGS RANDOLPH at one of our recent meetings, you will recall the intense labor and dedication that went into the Declaration of Independence, and our Constitution. These guidelines were hammered out by men who risked everything they had for the public interest.

It should be emphasized that nowhere in the Constitution is there any mention of race or class or varying degrees of privilege. Those demagogues who preach that our Constitution is obsolete should remember that our Nation offers political privileges and freedoms unmatched by any nation on earth.

Likewise, those who incite disobedience of the law to gain privileged status—under the protective cloak of constitutional rights—are demonstrating a dangerous ignorance of their Nation's history and purpose.

By now, only the most prejudiced or naive observers would deny that apostles of non-violence have had a cumulative effect on public respect for law and order. The ugly explosions of mob violence in Los Angeles, Chicago, and elsewhere can be traced—at least in part—to the pernicious doctrine that a citizen can be selective in his obedience to law.

One of our most acclaimed modern theologians, Reinhold Niebuhr, has pointed out that internal order, after all, is the first necessity of every society. Logically, it ranks ahead of even justice, for without order there can be no society and no justice.

Americans of today tend to forget that our truly great leaders of the past passionately believed what the Declaration of Independence and the Constitution said.

There is not the faintest suggestion of class consciousness or class action in the Constitution. Its only requirement of those who aspire to public office, for example, is an oath to support and defend that Constitution. The results have been phenomenal—Presidents, Senators, and judges from mule-drivers and railyarders. We made college presidents of men who worked their way through school, railroad presidents out of section hands, bank presidents out of boys who ran errands, and captains of industry from men who worked in the factories.

Oddly enough, by today's standards all of these men would have been considered underprivileged. To the extent that we have allowed ourselves to become class conscious, we have become a house divided by race and color, by capital and labor, and by rural and urban.

In our preoccupation with current disorders and problems, we have downgraded our own magnificent record of the past—a record of individual achievement and national progress unequalled in history. Our system works because it is based on the record of human experience and because it is, in the final analysis, rooted strongly in our common religious tradition. There is nothing in that religious tradition which holds that we can justify immoral acts on material grounds.

Neither our spiritual nor our governmental heritage tells us that a man may disobey the legal and moral codes with impunity if he considers himself underprivileged by com-

October 1, 1965

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

24925

it all in unselfish service for the well-being of mankind—for opportunity and tranquillity, prosperity, and peace.

My own life has had the special privilege for more than 30 years to be close to his life in association, admiration and affection.

I feel I can speak for all America in our every good wish to him on his birthday—for the day reminds us not only of the birth but of the worth of Theodore Francis Green.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, will the Senator from Rhode Island yield?

Mr. PASTORE. I yield.

Mr. MANSFIELD. There is not much I can add to what the distinguished senior Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. PASTORE] has just said about our former colleague, the esteemed Senator Green. The only man on whom has been bestowed the title of Chairman Emeritus of the Committee on Foreign Relations is the distinguished former Senator from Rhode Island.

I join my colleagues in expressing best wishes to Senator Green. He may be away from us, but he is never far from our thoughts.

Mr. PASTORE. I thank the Senator. I know that Senator Green will be highly pleased by the warm words delivered here today by his esteemed friend and former colleague, the Senator from Montana, our majority leader, MIKE MANSFIELD.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, will the Senator from Rhode Island yield?

Mr. PASTORE. I yield to the Senator from Alabama.

Mr. HILL. I commend the distinguished Senator from Rhode Island for his beautiful and eloquent tribute to Senator Green. It has been gratifying to me to hear this richly deserved, this most beautiful tribute. Senator Green is certainly worthy of the noble heritage of Roger Williams.

I join the senior Senator from Rhode Island in paying tribute to Theodore Francis Green for his heroic life, his many accomplishments, and his magnificent services to our country and to humanity.

Mr. PASTORE. I thank the Senator.

Mrs. SMITH. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. PASTORE. I yield to the distinguished Senator from Maine.

Mrs. SMITH. Mr. President, I should like to thank the distinguished Senator from Rhode Island for his statement in tribute to former Senator Theodore Francis Green and to ask him to express my good wishes, when he expresses his own and those of other Members of the Senate. I shall never forget the kindness to me when, as chairman of the Inaugural Committee, he asked me to accompany him as "his lady" to the ceremonies and activities on Inaugural Day of the second term of President Eisenhower.

Mr. PASTORE. I thank the Senator.

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. PASTORE. I yield to the distinguished Senator from Washington.

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. President, I associate myself with the eloquent remarks of the able and distinguished Senator

from Rhode Island and other Senators in tribute to Theodore Francis Green.

During his long period of service before retirement from the Senate, Senator Green represented the best in public service as a statesman, a scholar, a philanthropist—yes, even into his late eighties, as an athlete. We who frequent a special committee room of the Senate, where we get a little extra exercise, were always inspired by the vigor of Senator Green's participation in the athletic facilities made available to us.

Senator Green in indeed unique in American history. We who were associated with him in the U.S. Senate are the richer and the better for that association.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. PASTORE. I yield to the distinguished Senator from Missouri.

Mr. SYMINGTON. I am glad to associate myself with those of my colleagues congratulating Senator Theodore Francis Green on his 98th birthday. For many years I had the privilege of serving with him in this body. He was as highly respected and as much beloved by Members of the Senate as anyone in my experience. He was always in good humor, always kind, understanding, and helpful in committees, especially to junior Members like myself.

I hope and believe we shall have the privilege of celebrating Senator Green's 100th birthday anniversary 2 years from now.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. PASTORE. I yield to the distinguished Senator from Ohio.

Mr. LAUSCHE. I am delighted to join other Senators in expressing felicitations to former Senator Green on the occasion of his 98th birthday anniversary. My association with him was always inspiring. He was a gentle character. He was never offensive or cutting in his remarks. He was always accommodating, trying to help those with whom he worked.

I just remarked to Senator PASTORE that several years ago Senator Green delivered a talk before a breakfast group meeting which met at the Capitol on Wednesday morning each week. The subject of his talk was "The Time Is Now." In his remarks, Senator Green elaborated upon the necessity of not allowing time to pass for the execution of a task. Time when unused and allowed to pass never returns.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the text of that speech be printed at this point in the Record.

There being no objection, the speech was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

THE TIME IS NOW

(Senator Green's remarks at breakfast group meeting, Wednesday, May 4, 1960, 8:30 a.m., Vandenberg Room, the Capitol, Washington, D.C.)

Shortly after I accepted the invitation to lead this congressional breakfast group, I received a brief note from our chairman, Senator JOHN STENNIS, which simply read: "I am sure you will have something interesting and worthwhile for us." In all the long years which the good Lord has seen fit to allow me, I do not recall a single chal-

lenge which made me feel more lonely or unworthy.

What wise message could I leave with you here this morning? What was there about my life that could set me apart from the rest of you—all schooled in the same Christian tradition? Then a hard but obvious fact disturbed my meditation. I have lived longer than any of you and much longer than most. However much I might wish it otherwise, I am what might be called—but I hope respectfully—"an old man." The whole concept of time engulfed my thoughts and I was reminded of the eloquent message from the Gospel by John: "Work while it is day, for the night cometh when no man can work."

There is a story told of three devils who met to formulate the strategy they might best employ to ensnare the souls of men. The first devil advanced a plan that they roam throughout the world and proclaim that there is no God. The other devils discouraged him saying that men were too intelligent and the wonders of creation too convincing for men to accept that hypothesis. Then the second devil said: "I have the answer. We will go forth to all mankind and teach that the Bible is false; that it is nothing but a fraud." The other devils reproached him saying that man would never submit to that tactic because for centuries men had believed and loved and lived in testimony of the truth of Holy Writ. Then the shrewdest of all the devils offered the winning solution: "There is one sure way to capture the souls of men. We will simply tell all the inhabitants of the earth that 'there is plenty of time.'"

If I have learned one thing well in my long years, it is that there is never plenty of time. As the Good Book tells us, we know not the day nor the hour of our calling. The time for the lay apostolate is now.

It is more than coincidence that I, a Rhode Islander, should be asked to speak to you on this day, the 4th of May. On this date, in 1776, the Colony of Rhode Island and Providence Plantations, by action of its General Assembly and on the motion of my great grandfather, declared her independence from Great Britain, 2 months ahead of all the other American colonies, thus making her the oldest sovereign State in the whole Western Hemisphere. In her love for freedom, she threw off the shackles of an unwise parent who had forgotten that there were some things in life more precious than life itself. Those proud forebears of mine had the fortitude generated by faith in Almighty God, faith in each other and faith in the worth of their cause. They were true to the heritage of Roger Williams, the young refugee clergyman, who, 140 years earlier, founded our State and dedicated it to the principles of religious liberty and civil freedom in the face of overwhelming odds. The world stood aghast at this gallant little band of patriots from the smallest colony of all.

The great archeologist, James Breasted, reminds us that man became the first implement-making creature not later than the beginning of the ice age, probably a million years ago. At the same time he became the first weapon-making creature. Yet it is perhaps less than 5,000 years ago that man's conscience began to become a potent social force.

Today we are met at a fork in the highway of history. We who claim to be Christians and especially those of us privileged to serve as elected representatives of the people have a solemn duty. In our own country, we must covet no privilege for ourselves which we are not willing to share with every other citizen. In the worldwide clash with totalitarianism, at the very time when the sophisticated systems of modern warfare contain the capacity for mutual annihilation, we must pray for guidance. We must exert every positive peaceful influence within the scope of our

conscience and capabilities to save the world from those who would ruin it by their inhumanity, their injustice, and their immorality. Unless each of us conscientiously meets the political realities of the present, it may be later than we think for all of us.

As we ponder the restlessness about us today and search, each in his own heart, for his moment of destiny, let us recall some of the beautiful words from the first few verses of chapter III of Ecclesiastes:

"To all a season, and a time to every inclination under the heavens:

"A time to be born, and a time to die; a time to plant, and a time to pluck up the planting:

"A time to kill, and a time to heal; a time to break down, and a time to build:

"A time to weep, and a time to laugh; a time to mourn, and a time to dance:

"A time to rend, and a time to sew; a time to be silent, and a time to speak:

"A time to love, and a time to hate; a time of war, and a time of peace."

A few minutes ago, I introduced myself as one of the older generation. I make no claim, however, to the wisdom which is sometimes associated with age. Yet there lived many years ago an old man who was very wise and blessed. I refer to the Apostle Paul, who, as a prisoner awaiting execution in Nero's Rome, wrote a letter to some friends in the little church at Philippi, in Greece. In his letter, Paul wrote: "And this I pray, that your love may abound yet more and more in knowledge and all intelligence."

It is my hope that in the years remaining to us here, united in this Christian fellowship, the love of God will help us know our problems, give us the intelligence to perceive what should be done about them, and the courage to act accordingly, all in good time.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, I am delighted also to recall the great vigor exhibited by Senator Green while he was chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations in attending many engagements in foreign embassies that were incidental to his work.

He was in the nineties, but he moved about with great ease. He attended all meetings to which he was invited. I believe that, up until the very day of his retirement, he followed his unbroken habit of responding to the call of his duties.

I wish him good health, a contented and continued life.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from Ohio.

I yield now to the distinguished Senator from Georgia.

Mr. TALMADGE. Mr. President, I desire to associate myself with my colleagues who have congratulated former Senator Green on his 98th birthday.

I came to the Senate in 1957. I was assigned to the Rules and Administration Committee, on which Senator Green was then the ranking Democrat. I had the privilege of knowing him well. I admired him greatly. He was not only a man of remarkable physical condition, but also his mind was sharp, bright, and alert.

He was one of the most charming men I have ever known. Several years ago when Senator Green was a Member of the Senate and about 93 or 94 years of age, Mrs. Talmadge and I were driving to a social function in Washington. She looked out the window and said, "There goes Senator Green walking down the street. Let us stop and ask if we can take him where he is going." We stopped and I asked Senator Green if he cared to ride with us. He thanked us very

courteously, but told us that he preferred to walk.

I doubt if there has ever been a man in the history of the United States who, at the approximate age of 95 years, preferred walking around the streets of Washington to riding.

I shall always cherish his memory. He has been one of the most remarkable men in the history of our country.

He was an able and courageous Governor of Rhode Island. He had a distinguished career as a Senator of the United States. I wish him long and continued good health. Like my colleagues, I am looking forward to helping him celebrate his 100th birthday.

I thank the Senator from Rhode Island.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, I yield to my distinguished colleague from Rhode Island.

Mr. PELL. Mr. President, it is with warm and heartfelt admiration that I join my colleagues in paying tribute to my venerable and distinguished predecessor, Theodore Francis Green, on the occasion of his 98th birthday. I rejoice that he is enjoying in his sprightly way, the many laurels which the years have conferred so generously upon him. Governor of our State during a period of change and revision, distinguished U.S. Senator for nearly a quarter of a century, chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee, scholar, athlete, lawyer, businessman and political extraordinary—he is a living tribute to the genius and durability of the New England character. His record is a challenge to us all, particularly to the junior Senator from Rhode Island who succeeded to his seat in 1960.

I am proud of the fact that in a modest way I have been able to follow a few of Senator Green's footsteps, as a member of the Foreign Relations Committee and now, this month, as a chairman of the U.S. delegation to the NATO parliamentarians' conference. If in the years ahead I can succeed in doing half as much as Senator Green did, I shall be happy indeed.

I join my colleagues in wishing Senator Green continued good health in the years ahead, knowing that he fully intends to fill his role as the oldest man to serve in the U.S. Senate by "serving" as a member emeritus well into his second century. And finally, I would point out that the Senate has given him a most appropriate birthday present by passing again a bill which it approved in earlier form in 1960 as his last legislative act. I refer to S. 1855, my bill to establish a Roger Williams National Memorial which was approved on September 23 and which is now pending on the House Calendar. Its final enactment will be a fitting way to open Theodore Francis Green's 99th year.

Mr. PASTORE. I thank my colleague. With the expression of those fine sentiments, I think we can conclude by saying to Theodore Francis Green, "ad multos annos."

NUCLEAR TEST BAN SAFEGUARDS

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Mr. Jack Rosen of the staff of the Joint Committee on

Atomic Energy be permitted the privilege of the floor during the discussion of my remarks in connection with nuclear test ban safeguards.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. President, 2 years have passed since the debate in this Chamber on the limited nuclear test ban treaty. That treaty received the overwhelming consent of this body. In considering the treaty, three committees met in combined session for many days of hearings. Those committees were the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, Senate Armed Services Committee, and the Senate membership of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy. In addition, the Preparedness Investigating Subcommittee of the Armed Services Committee held special hearings.

During the course of those lengthy hearings, the Chairman and all the members of the Joint Chiefs of Staff testified. These five eminent military leaders of our armed services supported the limited test ban treaty, but in doing so they set forth to the Senate the need for establishing safeguards for our security which would make possible our consent to this treaty.

Those four safeguards which the Joint Chiefs of Staff recommended and which President Kennedy endorsed in a letter to the majority and minority leaders of this body during the floor debate on the test ban treaty read as follows:

1. The conduct of comprehensive, aggressive, and continuing underground nuclear test programs designed to add to our knowledge and improve our weapons in all areas of significance to our military posture for the future.

2. The maintenance of modern nuclear laboratory facilities and programs in theoretical and exploratory nuclear technology which will attract, retain, and insure the continued application of our human scientific resources to these programs on which continued progress in nuclear technology depends.

3. The maintenance of the facilities and resources necessary to institute promptly nuclear tests in the atmosphere should they be deemed essential to our national security or should the treaty or any of its terms be abrogated by the Soviet Union.

4. The improvement of our capability, within feasible and practical limits, to monitor the terms of the treaty, to detect violations, and to maintain our knowledge of Sino-Soviet nuclear activity, capabilities, and achievements.

The Senate Preparedness Subcommittee of the Senate Armed Services Committee and the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy have followed the implementation of those safeguards very closely during the past 2 years. Each of these Committees has followed the safeguards in hearings on authorizing legislation and in special hearings. Recently, in 3 days of hearings, I chaired combined meetings of the Senate Special Subcommittee on Nuclear Safeguards and the Military Applications Subcommittee of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy looking into the current status of the four safeguards.

Mr. President, I mention that the members of the Nuclear Safeguards Subcommittee, comprised of myself as chairman, the distinguished senior Senator

October 1, 1965

24927

from Missouri [Mr. SYMINGTON], the distinguished senior Senator from Maine [Mrs. SMITH], and the distinguished chairman of the Preparedness Subcommittee of the Committee on Armed Services, the distinguished junior Senator from Mississippi [Mr. STENNIS]. From the Military Applications Subcommittee of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, we were fortunate to have the chairman of the Joint Committee of Atomic Energy, Representative HOLIFIELD, and Representative HOSMER, Representative BATES, the senior Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON], the senior Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. PASTORE], past chairman and current vice chairman of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, and the junior Senator from Nebraska [Mr. CURTIS].

In addition, we were ably assisted by the presence of Col. Glenn Smith, retired, from the staff of the Preparedness Subcommittee, and Jack Rosen from the staff of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, as well as the executive director of the staff of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, Mr. John Conway.

We are all aware that in the Senate, without the able assistance of professional staff people, we could not do our committee or Senate work properly.

We were fortunate in having such a high degree of professionalism in the presence of the gentleman to whom I have just referred.

Mr. President, I especially compliment and express my deep appreciation to the distinguished senior Senator from Missouri [Mr. SYMINGTON], who spent a good deal of time in the preparation for the hearings and in connection with the hearings as well.

The same is true of the distinguished senior Senator from Maine [Mrs. SMITH], who attended all our sessions and was most diligent and provocative in her interrogation, and who followed all the proceedings very closely.

Likewise the junior Senator from Mississippi [Mr. STENNIS], who served as an ex-officio member, was of great assistance in connection with the well-detailed hearings that we held.

I also express my appreciation to the other members of the Preparedness Subcommittee who were able to attend and participate in the hearings, as well as the other members of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy.

Mr. President, we heard testimony from the directors of our nuclear weapons laboratories, from one of the Atomic Energy Commissioners, from representatives of the Department of Defense, and from the Director of the Central Intelligence Agency. Much of what we heard was sensitive information relating vitally to our national security which cannot be disclosed in an unclassified manner, but I do believe that I can report to the Senate in an unclassified way a summary sketch of the conclusions that I drew from sitting through those hearings, conclusions which I believe are shared by my colleagues from both committees who participated in these meetings.

First, I can report to the Senate that the Atomic Energy Commission, ably assisted by the Department of Defense, has

indeed been carrying out during these past 2 years a comprehensive, aggressive, and continuing underground nuclear test program. The AEC has announced the conduct of 62 underground tests since the test ban treaty was signed. Most of these have been weapons research or development tests, some have been Department of Defense weapons effects tests, others have been tests for Plowshare—a program to develop nuclear explosives for peaceful purposes. Two tests have been carried out in this period for the purpose of research on seismic detection of underground nuclear explosions.

Significant information has been developed from these underground nuclear explosions. Information of great importance to our national security and to the development of peaceful nuclear explosive technology has been acquired.

The second safeguard concerns the maintenance of modern laboratory facilities and programs in nuclear technology. From the testimony received by the two committees on August 16 and 17 of this year, I can report to you that our weapons laboratories have been adequately supported in these past 2 years by both the Congress and the executive branch. It was also made clear to us, however, by our weapons laboratory directors that the viability and vigor of our nuclear weapons laboratories depends upon the underground test programs. Without the opportunity to carry out the necessary experiments, the weapons development program would soon stagnate and our scientists would look elsewhere for challenges to their intellects. Speculation and even careful theoretical studies must be subject to experimental verification if the results are to be meaningful and productive. Our laboratories are carrying out fruitful and meaningful programs involving experiments with sophisticated research instruments and, as necessary, with nuclear explosives within the terms of the limited test ban treaty.

Safeguard No. 3 relates to the maintenance of facilities and resources necessary to institute promptly nuclear tests in the atmosphere, should the treaty be abrogated or should the supreme interests of our country require this. Possible example: Extraordinary developments by the Chinese Communists. The AEC and Department of Defense witnesses who appeared before us testified that the readiness achieved and being maintained is adequate to our needs. Some of our members have a concern, however, that a time of abrogation of the treaty will be a critical time and therefore our readiness to carry out significant weapons tests of great import should be an almost instant readiness. While we are much better prepared today than we were in 1961 when the Soviets resumed atmospheric testing and while instant readiness is impossible, we are not in my opinion as ready as we should be for the circumstance of an abrogation of the treaty by the Soviet Union. Here again I would like to point up the close relationship between our readiness to resume significant atmospheric tests and the continuance of an aggressive, comprehensive underground test program. Without continued

underground tests our readiness program would be essentially a sterile program.

The fourth safeguard is the safeguard of monitoring the terms of the limited test ban treaty and maintaining our knowledge of Sino-Soviet nuclear activity. From the evidence available to our committees I feel that the limited test ban treaty is being monitored well. We have, as you know, had satellites instrumented for the detection of high altitude events, and instruments for the detection of atmospheric events are emplaced around the world. Members of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy soon after the signing of the test ban treaty traveled around the world to inspect our detection capabilities and to determine at first hand what improvements were needed. In the past 2 years improvements have been made in our capability to monitor the limited test ban treaty.

Research has also been going on with regard to detecting and identifying underground nuclear explosions which are now legal under the test ban treaty but would be illegal under a comprehensive or a total test ban treaty. Progress is being made through the construction of large seismic arrays and the use of computers to improve our capability of detecting seismic shocks and of identifying natural earthquakes. However, as we lower the seismic detection threshold we detect many more seismic events. In fact, one school of thought is concerned that as we lower the detection threshold we might complicate the task of identifying the cause of the seismic event. Construction and emplacement of these improved detection equipments is underway, and it is much too early to make a reliable judgment on the successes of these techniques. If we can increase the percentage of identification of natural earthquakes, this will reduce the number of events that are in the uncertain category—that is, events that are uncertain as to whether they are natural earthquakes or produced by underground explosions. If they are suspected as underground explosions we must have some means of determining if they were from a conventional, that is high explosive, source or from a nuclear explosion. No method has been suggested to us for identifying underground nuclear explosions by their seismic signals. Positive identification of underground nuclear explosions depends upon the collecting of some kind of radioactive debris either because the test has vented to the atmosphere or we have dug down at the site of the test and discovered such debris. Now there may be several reasons for being suspicious that a given seismic signal is manmade and not natural, but being suspicious is not synonymous with the verification of that suspicion.

I might add at this point, while all the members of the two committees attending the hearings were quite impressed with the research going forward in the seismic detection field, several members were concerned that a similar active and priority research program is not moving nearly so fast in studying the art of decoupling, muffling, or concealing underground nuclear tests. Some work has been done along this line but

the effort has been very limited and several members expressed their concern that we are undertaking negotiations which could lead to a comprehensive test ban without being sufficiently informed about the techniques that could be employed to circumvent the terms of such a treaty. In this connection it is worth emphasizing that the art of concealment of nuclear tests, when it is pursued, goes forward, in my opinion, faster than the art of detection.

This point I wish to emphasize, because it was confirmed by the distinguished scientists who were present at our hearings.

I should also point out that, if an underground nuclear explosion is small enough, it will escape detection, even by the improved detection system. Methods of making relatively large underground nuclear explosions look seismically like small explosions are also possible. I for one do not believe that "what we do not know cannot hurt us." In fact, the opposite is true. Knowledge gained from even small underground nuclear explosions is important and we can never say that such knowledge may not be crucial.

Remember that we do not know how to identify underground nuclear explosions from a distance and, if they are small or decoupled, we do not even detect them. For a long time the Soviets were claiming all underground nuclear explosions are detectable and on-site inspections are unnecessary. Similar to the Nazi propaganda policy before World War II they apparently believe if you tell a lie enough times people will eventually believe it. Unfortunately, such statements have been repeated often enough and apparently convinced some of our allies and many of the so-called neutral nations that this is so. It is interesting, therefore, to note that according to the London Economist issue of August 21-27, this year, the Soviet Ambassador to the Geneva Disarmament Conference, Semyon Tsarapkin, admitted on August 11, that Russia's seismologists cannot tell whether all subterranean events are nuclear explosions or not. Tsarapkin did not go on to admit or talk about the necessity of on-site inspections to monitor a comprehensive test ban treaty.

Recently at the Geneva Disarmament Conference a comprehensive test ban treaty was discussed. I can tell you now, without fear of contradiction, that we do not know how to monitor a comprehensive test ban treaty so that we will be able to adequately verify the terms of such a treaty without on-site inspections.

With respect to the limited test ban treaty, I feel that that treaty has worked to our benefit and the free world's benefit due in a major way to the proposal of the Joint Chiefs of Staff for the four safeguards, and because those four safeguards are being implemented. I might mention, Mr. President, that the Joint Chiefs of Staff consider that the progress which has been made is satisfactory in meeting the requirements of the four safeguards to which I have referred in my remarks. A comprehensive test ban would destroy three of those safeguards and without adequate means of verification, including on-site inspections, would

make a mockery of the fourth safeguard. Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, will the Senator define the term "comprehensive"?

Mr. JACKSON. If the Senator will defer for a moment, I shall be through with my prepared remarks.

Mr. President, the Congress cannot rest on what it has done. Programs must be implemented by the administration, and the Congress must from time to time check into that implementation. Our combined committees of the Senate Armed Services Committee and the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy expect the staffs of the committees to keep in constant touch with the implementation of the safeguards and the committee chairmen and the members intend to hold review hearings on these safeguards at least once each year.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Washington yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MONTROIA in the chair). Does the Senator from Washington yield to the Senator from Ohio?

Mr. JACKSON. I am happy to yield to the Senator from Ohio.

Mr. LAUSCHE. My recollection is that when the limited test ban treaty was adopted, the ban was imposed upon tests except those committed underground and provided that when committed underground they did not diffuse radioactive debris upon the lands of adjoining nations and in the air. Having in mind the limited test ban treaty, what other inclusions would there be in banning tests in the comprehensive ban?

Mr. JACKSON. Let me amplify for a moment on what is prohibited. Under the test ban treaty, atmospheric testing is prohibited; outer space testing is prohibited; and underwater testing is also prohibited. This leaves only testing underground. Therefore, a comprehensive test ban would cover the last area, which is underground testing, so as to prohibit all nuclear weapons testing.

Mr. LAUSCHE. The Senator stated that if a comprehensive test ban was agreed upon, three of the safeguards which he identified would be eliminated. Would the Senator elaborate on that item?

Mr. JACKSON. The first safeguard which would be eliminated would be the ability to conduct underground tests and second our ability to maintain adequate, modern, and effective laboratories. I do not believe there is any question that if scientists are not given the opportunity to test, the weapons laboratories will go down to zero. The whole basis of science involves experimentation and, therefore, we would be cutting off our ability to move forward, and to maintain our security through scientific achievement. In recent times, our security has been based primarily upon the ability to marshal the resources of science and technology and to use those resources in order to advance the security of our Nation and other free nations. If we had a comprehensive test ban I am sure that the ability to maintain a modern nuclear capability and to maintain adequate personnel in our laboratories would come to an end.

As I said before, it would eliminate our ability to carry out a vigorous underground testing program. At the present time I can report to the Senate that we are actually doing much better underground in our testing than we had anticipated.

We are making good progress in maintaining a modern, up-to-date nuclear arsenal. With the denial of testing we would lose that opportunity, and lastly, we would not be able to do the job of monitoring effectively a test ban which is comprehensive if it did not provide for adequate on-site inspections.

We simply cannot, with the scientific information available to us, undertake a comprehensive test ban treaty which would ban underground testing without on-site inspection.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Will the Senator elaborate upon his statement—

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, will the Senator from Washington yield?

Mr. JACKSON. I also, of course, should mention that our ability to maintain a state of readiness to test in the atmosphere would be lost, because in time the laboratories would disintegrate and we would not have the capability, in the event of a surprise move—such as occurred in 1961 by the Soviets—to resume testing.

Mr. LAUSCHE. The Senator made the statement that experience has demonstrated that the claims made by Soviet Russia that scientific instruments were available which would record with clarity and certainty whether a seismic tremor was produced by natural causes or by an atomic explosion has been demonstrated to be unsound and untrue.

Mr. JACKSON. The Soviet statement is false. While we can detect seismic disturbances—

Mr. LAUSCHE. Yes.

Mr. JACKSON. We cannot identify them as underground nuclear tests short of on-site inspections.

Mrs. SMITH. Mr. President, will the Senator from Washington yield?

Mr. JACKSON. I am happy to yield to the distinguished lady from Maine, who has worked so helpfully and so ably in connection with the hearings.

Mrs. SMITH. Mr. President, I wish to commend the Junior Senator from Washington for the excellent leadership that he has given as chairman of our watchdog group on the test ban safeguards. I share the concern that he has expressed for the need to do more with respect to certain safeguards. I share his views with respect to the grave dangers of a comprehensive test ban treaty at this time unless there are ironclad on-site inspection safeguards established. Apparently Russia will not agree to on-site inspection.

Since the ratification of the test ban treaty, there has been the very grave development of Red China joining the nuclear power club with her nuclear capability having been indicated in the nuclear explosions that she has achieved. Inasmuch as Red China is not a party to the nuclear test ban treaty, she is not restrained with respect to making open air nuclear tests as are the parties to the treaty. It is further clear that Red

October 1, 1965

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

24929

China would not only refuse on-site inspection as has Russia but that Red China will continue to be a growing threat in the development of nuclear power without the restraint of a test ban treaty.

Under present conditions, the only question is one of time as to when Red China attains a degree of nuclear capability as to threaten the security of the United States, which Red China has vowed to destroy. Thus, time is working against the best interests of the United States and our country must be prepared to resume testing as soon as possible in the event of abrogation of the test ban treaty by Russia or any of the other parties to the treaty.

While progress has been made on this safeguard, I agree with the able junior Senator from Washington that we need to do more and in a real sense of urgency.

Mr. President, in closing, I wish to thank my distinguished colleague for his generous remarks with respect to me personally. It has been a privilege to serve with him as chairman.

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. President, I deeply appreciate the thoughtful remarks of the Senator from Maine. She has taken a keen interest throughout the hearings, and prior to the hearings, in this important problem of nuclear test ban safeguards.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, will the Senator from Washington yield?

Mr. JACKSON. I am happy to yield to the Senator from Mississippi.

Mr. STENNIS. I thank the Senator from Washington for yielding to me.

Mr. President, I wish especially to highly commend the membership of this subcommittee of our Preparedness Subcommittee for the very fine and outstanding work which they have done this year in a highly important but very difficult field; namely, an overlook of the four safeguards that were definitely adopted by the Preparedness Subcommittee during the hearings in 1963 on the nuclear test ban treaty. The Senator from Washington was the author of that resolution providing for those safeguards. This subcommittee of our Preparedness Subcommittee is charged with the responsibility of making a continuing surveillance over this safeguard program.

This is a highly technical field. It is a very difficult field. But the Senator from Washington is unusually well qualified in this field and has done an excellent job. The work of this subcommittee is of unquestioned value to the entire Nation.

I had the privilege of asking these three Members, the Senator from Washington [Mr. JACKSON], the Senator from Maine [Mrs. SMITH], and the Senator from Missouri [Mr. SYMINGTON], to serve on that subcommittee and later appointing them. They have done an unusual piece of high quality work. They have been diligent and conscientious, and have made a report of value and significance, of value to every department of the Government, particularly in the field of the military, in the field of the Department of State, in the field of the Atomic Energy Commission, and others.

I take great pride in their achievement and the report they have filed, and

wish personally to thank them. I am sure I speak for the other Members of the Senate and for the people of the Nation. I look forward to their further activities in this highly important field. We can all rest assured that the legislative department, the Congress is well represented in this field of legislative overlook and that the work is in competent and dedicated hands.

Mr. JACKSON. I know I speak for the members of our special subcommittee in expressing to the chairman of the subcommittee, the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. STENNIS], our appreciation for the support he has given us. The fact that the staff was able to provide its best professional talents is in no small measure responsible for whatever work we were able to do. We are deeply indebted to the chairman of the subcommittee, Mr. STENNIS.

Mrs. SMITH. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me at that point?

Mr. JACKSON. I yield to the Senator from Maine.

Mrs. SMITH. I would like to join with the distinguished Senator from Washington, chairman of our special subcommittee, in expressing appreciation and thanks to the very able chairman of the Subcommittee on Preparedness, Mr. STENNIS. It has been a very great privilege to serve under the leadership such as the Senator from Mississippi has given us. I want to personally express my thanks to him. I also want to pay my respects to the senior Senator from Missouri for his outstanding work as a member of the watchdog committee on the test ban safeguards. He has made a great contribution to his country in these endeavors.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. JACKSON. I am glad to yield now to the distinguished Senator from Missouri, who spent much time in preparation for the hearings, and who made valuable contributions to this work.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, I would associate myself with the remarks of the distinguished chairman of the Military Preparedness Subcommittee, Mr. STENNIS, and the distinguished Senator from Maine [Mrs. SMITH], about the outstanding work the Senator from Washington [Mr. JACKSON] has done with respect to this matter.

It could well be—and I believe it probably is—the most important subject the free world has to face today.

As a result of the work of the Special Subcommittee on Nuclear Safeguards, with the able Senator from Mississippi [Mr. STENNIS] and the able Senator from Maine [Mrs. SMITH], we now have a factual statement about this problem which may be somewhat overdue, because so many people who talk on the subject do not go into the details as has the distinguished Senator from Washington and his committee in this investigation.

As the Senate remembers, the Preparedness Subcommittee did not approve the test ban treaty. However, the distinguished Senator from Washington [Mr. JACKSON] and I voted for it and at that time discussed it at great length.

What particularly appeals to me about this statement is that, first, he does not express complete satisfaction with respect to the maintenance of facilities and resources which are vital; and, secondly, he points out in clear fashion the dangers of any comprehensive treaty without adequate on-site inspection.

I am glad the Senator is supported in that position by the distinguished Senator from Maine, who has also worked hard to obtain the facts in this field.

I was one of the Senators appointed to go to Geneva to observe but because of the sharpness of the denial of any interest in the proposed treaty on the part of the Soviet delegate, Mr. Tsarapkin, the meeting recessed.

I again congratulate the Senator from Washington for this report. It is a major contribution to the future security of the United States.

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. President, I would like to conclude by saying that it is the intention of the Special Subcommittee on Nuclear Safeguards and the Military Applications Subcommittee of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy to submit a classified report to the executive department, going into greater detail and giving classified information which we could not do in this discussion on the floor. I give assurance that we shall do everything we can, in a non-partisan way, to fulfill a commitment—it was a covenant—between the Senate and the executive branch on the four safeguards mentioned. If we maintain those four safeguards conscientiously and with great diligence, I have no doubt about our ability to maintain our own defense posture and to deter thermonuclear war.

BREAKFAST GROUP REMARKS OF SENATOR FANNIN

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, on Wednesday morning of this week our esteemed friend, Senator PAUL J. FANNIN, of Arizona, made some remarks to a breakfast group meeting of Senators here in the Capitol. He summed up in a few minutes much of the wisdom of the ages as well as some of his own wisdom. He also gave clear and necessary guidelines of conduct for our future if we successfully maintain self-government and individual freedom. I consider the Senator's remarks highly valuable, constructive, and timely as did all who heard him.

I commend Senator FANNIN, and also commend the reading of this wonderful address to each Member of the Senate and the House and to citizens throughout the Nation. In order that it may have wide publication, I ask unanimous consent that his remarks be included in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

REMARKS BY SENATOR PAUL J. FANNIN, SENATE BREAKFAST GROUP, SEPTEMBER 29, 1965

More than 50 years ago, a famous British jurist, Lord Moulton, made some observations on law and manners which I submit are still valid and worthy of our serious consideration today. In his article he out-

lined what he called the three great domains of human action. First was the domain of positive law which prescribes our actions and which must be obeyed.

At the opposite end of the scale he put the domain of free choice, which includes all those acts we claim a right to perform in complete freedom. But in between these two domains, he said there is another large and important area ruled neither by positive law nor absolute freedom.

He called this vital middle ground the domain of the unenforceable. How large this area is depends upon the extent to which a nation trusts its citizens and the way they behave in response to that trust. Lord Moulton concluded that in the final analysis—and at this point I quote him exactly: "The true measure of a nation's greatness is the extent to which the individuals composing the Nation can be trusted to obey self-imposed law."

If we apply Lord Moulton's standard of greatness to the United States of America today, how do we measure up? This is a sobering question for which there is no easy answer. But it is a question all Americans should be asking themselves today.

At this moment in history, I am concerned that our country is not measuring up to greatness in all of the ways that it can and should. The annual FBI reports have been indicating an alarming increase in crime for a long time. But it has taken a savage explosion of mob violence in Los Angeles to shock us into recognizing that crime has become the number one domestic issue confronting our Nation. Since the riots I'm sure all of us have formed some personal opinions on the subject. The public dialog of condemnation and explanation continues—and this is as it should be in a free society.

Seldom in our history has a thorough, searching national discussion been more in order. In one of our own recent meetings—incidentally I count these meetings among the most rewarding associations of my brief Senate experience—we enjoyed a fine talk on some aspects of this problem by Senator Wallace Bennett.

More recently in a talk on the floor, our colleague, Senator ROBERT BYRD, of West Virginia, put the Los Angeles riot in proper perspective as another horrible example of the overall weakening state of law and order in the land.

We can no longer afford to ignore the unmistakable evidence that a moral cancer is spreading in our society. Including the recent additions of mass murder and destruction, our crime rate now represents a serious threat to the basic codes of human behavior which most Americans have long taken for granted. Because we have been entrusted with public responsibility at a high level, it is especially incumbent upon us to defend these codes and reinforce them by all possible means.

A vital first step in preparing this defense is suggested by a phrase in the constitution of my State of Arizona which I want to share with you. Section 1 of article 2 reads as follows:

"A frequent recurrence to fundamental principles is essential to the security of individual rights and the perpetuity of free government."

In another troubled age, 600 years before Christ, we were admonished in much the same language by the prophet Jeremiah when he said: "Stand ye in the old ways, and see, and ask for the old paths, where is the good way, and walk therein."

Surely no further warnings should be needed to convince us that we have strayed from the proven good way of the past, and that we have been neglecting our fundamental principles. All of us know that among these fundamental principles is personal responsibility for one's own conduct and actions. Behind this principle is the combined

weight and experience of our Judeo-Christian heritage.

Like our fathers and grandfathers before us, we have been taught a morality which places a distinct obligation upon each individual in our society. We have built our society on the firm belief that the Creator endowed each of us with certain inalienable rights. And because of our belief in the worth and dignity of the individual, we have constructed a framework of constitutional law to protect and enforce the rights of each citizen.

Implicit in both our spiritual and governmental life has always been the concept of responsibility accompanying privilege. For every right there is a corresponding duty.

Referring to Lord Moulton's categories of human action, our Founding Fathers deliberately expanded the realm of free choice beyond anything ever attempted before.

In all of their recorded statements or published writings, so far as I can determine, there is nothing to indicate they ever gave any credence to the idea that civil responsibility was a collective matter. To them it was highly personal and individual—and they had supreme confidence in the ability of a free republic, conceived in liberty and dedicated to human welfare, to grow and prosper under this concept. In short, they were convinced that it is the individual who makes society, and not society the individual.

Contrast that with the modern doctrine expressed by sociologists and, unfortunately, even some public officials, that society is somehow responsible for the criminal acts of a few individuals. For example, how often have you heard well-meaning people say that "society is really to blame for juvenile delinquency"?

Or consider the rash of statements in the wake of the terrible riots in Los Angeles. From spokesmen prominent in Government, religion, and the civil rights movement we heard incredible assertions that all of us must share some of the guilt of those who killed, burned, and looted.

This absurd notion should have no place in American thought. The fact that it has been accepted by so many otherwise intelligent people is a graphic illustration of how far we have deviated from our original principles.

Those who assembled at Philadelphia to write the Constitution would have rejected this kind of thinking. They believed—as we still do—that man does have the inherent capacity to govern himself, if he is encouraged and trained to do so.

Thus our Constitution and laws impose the minimum possible amount of restraint upon the individual in the exercise of his freedom.

Again in Lord Moulton's terms, our system places a tremendous degree of trust in the individual citizen to obey self-imposed law. And by that standard of measurement, we did indeed achieve greatness as a Nation. At the same time, however, the founders of our Republic knew very well that unrestricted democracy would degenerate into anarchy, just as unbridled license will destroy the individual. James Madison and Alexander Hamilton, two of the authentic geniuses of the Convention, argued this point with eloquence and determination. It was Hamilton who declared, and I quote:

"Give all power to the many, and they will oppress the few. Give all power to the few, they will oppress the many. Both, therefore, ought to have the power that each may defend itself against the other. . . . We are forming a republican government. Real liberty is never found in despotism or the extremes of democracy. If we incline too much to democracy, we shall soon shoot into monarchy."

The inspired result was a system of government which defined and guaranteed indi-

vidual rights but also demanded of each citizen that he respect the rights of others. This duty of the individual citizen, under our system of constitutional government, is in perfect harmony with the spiritual commands of the Christian faith, because it is derived directly from them.

When we say that every American should respect the rights of others, whether it be their person or property, isn't this just another practical way of following the Golden Rule of Christ? We were told by Christ that all laws rested upon two fundamental commandments; namely, that we should love the Lord above all things and that we should also love our neighbors as ourselves.

From the fine presentation by Senator JENNINGS RANDOLPH at one of our recent meetings, you will recall the intense labor and dedication that went into the Declaration of Independence, and our Constitution. These guidelines were hammered out by men who risked everything they had for the public interest.

It should be emphasized that nowhere in the Constitution is there any mention of race or class or varying degrees of privilege. Those demagogues who preach that our Constitution is obsolete should remember that our Nation offers political privileges and freedoms unmatched by any nation on earth.

Likewise, those who incite disobedience of the law to gain privileged status—under the protective cloak of constitutional rights—are demonstrating a dangerous ignorance of their Nation's history and purpose.

By now, only the most prejudiced or naive observers would deny that apostles of non-violence have had a cumulative effect on public respect for law and order. The ugly explosions of mob violence in Los Angeles, Chicago, and elsewhere can be traced—at least in part—to the pernicious doctrine that a citizen can be selective in his obedience to law.

One of our most acclaimed modern theologians, Reinhold Niebuhr, has pointed out that internal order, after all, is the first necessity of every society. Logically, it ranks ahead of even justice, for without order there can be no society and no justice.

Americans of today tend to forget that our truly great leaders of the past passionately believed what the Declaration of Independence and the Constitution said.

There is not the faintest suggestion of class consciousness or class action in the Constitution. Its only requirement of those who aspire to public office, for example, is an oath to support and defend that Constitution. The results have been phenomenal—Presidents, Senators, and judges from mule-drivers and railsplitters. We made college presidents of men who worked their way through school, railroad presidents out of section hands, bank presidents out of boys who ran errands, and captains of industry from men who worked in the factories.

Oddly enough, by today's standards all of these men would have been considered underprivileged. To the extent that we have allowed ourselves to become class conscious, we have become a house divided by race and color, by capital and labor, and by rural and urban.

In our preoccupation with current disorders and problems, we have downgraded our own magnificent record of the past—a record of individual achievement and national progress unequalled in history. Our system works because it is based on the record of human experience and because it is, in the final analysis, rooted strongly in our common religious tradition. There is nothing in that religious tradition which holds that we can justify immoral acts on material grounds.

Neither our spiritual nor our governmental heritage tells us that a man may disobey the legal and moral codes with impunity if he considers himself underprivileged by com-

SENDER WILL CHECK CLASSIFICATION TOP AND BOTTOM			
UNCLASSIFIED		CONFIDENTIAL	
CENTRAL INTELLIGENCE AGENCY OFFICIAL ROUTING SLIP			
TO	NAME AND ADDRESS	DATE	INITIALS
1	Mr. Elder 7D5617	10/6	<i>[Signature]</i>
2			
3			
4			
5			
6			
ACTION		DIRECT REPLY	PREPARE REPLY
APPROVAL		DISPATCH	RECOMMENDATION
COMMENT		FILE	RETURN
CONCURRENCE		INFORMATION	SIGNATURE
<p>Remarks: Attached is an extract from the <u>Congressional Record</u> of 1 October containing remarks by Senator Jackson on the hearings conducted by the combined committees having an interest in the nuclear test ban. Some of the more interesting parts have been marked. A second copy is attached for Mr. McCone who, I am sure, would be interested in receiving it. Colonel Smith, of the Preparedness Subcommittee, has been in touch with us and indicated that Senator Jackson proposes to have something further on this early next year, presumably this is covered by Senator Jackson's concluding statement.</p>			
FOLD HERE TO RETURN TO SENDER			
FROM: NAME, ADDRESS AND PHONE NO.			DATE
Assistant Legislative Counsel, <i>[Signature]</i>			4 Oct

Approved For Release 2004/10/08 : CIA-RDP67B00446R000100330057-3

ILLEGIB

Approved For Release 2004/10/08 : CIA-RDP67B00446R000100330057-3